

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

Claim Objections

In the Final Objection, the Examiner objects to Claim 6 for an informality therein and suggests a correction to Claim 6. Therefore, Applicants have amended Claim 6 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner continues to reject Claims 1-2, 6-7, 12-13 and 15 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Liao et al. (US 6,717,358). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in the prior response to this rejection, independent Claim 1 recited the feature of “a second electrode in contact with the layer having the donor level.” A similar feature was in independent Claim 6. In the prior rejection and this rejection, the Examiner contended that Liao discloses a second electrode (110) in contact with the layer (131) having the donor level. Applicants respectfully disagreed.

As Applicants explained, Liao appears to disclose that the layer (131) having the donor level is not in contact with the second electrode (110). More specifically, layer 131 in Liao appears to be part of a connecting unit 130 (see e.g. Fig. 2 in Liao). Connecting unit 130 is disposed between EL units 120. Hence, an EL unit is between anode 110 and connecting unit 130 (see e.g. Fig. 1 in Liao).

As a result, layer 131 (in connecting unit 130) cannot be in contact with the second electrode (anode 110).

In the Response to Arguments in the Final Rejection, the Examiner states that Applicant argues that a second electrode must be in direct and physically contact with the layer having the donor level, but this limitation is not required by the claim language. Instead, the Examiner contends that broadly interpreted, the claim language does not exclude a second electrode in electrically contact with the layer having the donor level, and in Liao, the second electrode 110 is in electrically contact with the layer having the donor level 131 (in connecting unit 130).

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite “a second electrode in direct contact with the layer having the donor level.” A similar amendment is being made to independent Claim 6. As explained above, in Liao, the layer (131) having the donor level is not in direct contact with the second electrode (110), as an EL unit is *between* anode 110 and connecting unit 130 which includes layer 131 (see e.g. Fig. 1 in Liao). Therefore, Liao does not disclose or suggest this amended feature of Claims 1 and 6.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 6 are not disclosed or suggested by Liao, and Claims 1, 6 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Liao. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Dated: October 27, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568